

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 93 04:30:06 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #355
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 30 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 355

Today's Topics:

 Codeless Tech Debate (2 msgs)
 Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 30 Sep 93 02:44:54 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
fmitch@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jon Bloom, KE3Z (jbbloom@arrl.org) wrote:

: See the *Proceedings of the 11th Space Symposium and AMSAT Annual
: Meeting*, which should be available from ARRL in a week or so. The
: paper, "Digital Processing of Weak Signals Buried in Noise," by
: Darrel Emerson, AA7FV, describes his use of DSP in the ZRO test
: (which is a quasi-contest to see how well you can receive weak signals
: through the satellite). To make a long story very short, the author
: was able to copy Morse signals using DSP at a level 9 dB below the
: lowest level he could copy by ear (30 dB below the satellite beacon),
: and well below the lowest level he could *detect* by ear.

Gee, I got to level 8 (24 db below the beacon) by ear easily...
I could hear (by ear) level 9 (27 db below the beacon)... does
that mean I was DSPing "mindfully" (could that be the famous

"ESP" that we used to hear so much about) at level 9???... if I practiced "mindfully" DSP/ESPing my *_CW_Morse_*, could I get to level A (30 db below the beacon, (levels in hex for you non Computer Types)? And, that was before I spent the bux and got a real DSP/ESP box. Do you think the antennas, preamps, 7/8 inch hardline and receiver (with narrow *_CW_Morse_* filter, of course) and my aversion to having to copy *_CW_Morse_* had anything to do with me only getting the level 8 certificates?

And a personal observation on the new DSP filter boxes... I have tried most of them (JPS, W9GR, Time Wave, etc.) and they do a marvelous job on certain types of noise. Why I can turn the tone notch filter on and the 40 meter band is completely silent from 7.0 to 7.150, except for some strange clicking sounds.

Mitch, WA4OSR

: Of course, this has nothing to do with the validity or lack thereof
: of the Morse requirement, but it is a considerably more interesting
: topic to discuss. :-)

: -----

: Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
: American Radio Relay League |
: 225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

--

fmitch@netcom.com

Felton Mitchell, WA4OSR in Mobile, Alabama USA

co-sysop for W4IAX bbs running fbb ... sysop for WA4OSR DXCluster in Mobile..

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 1993 14:12:45 GMT

From: agate!spool.mu.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!fmitch@ames.arpa

Subject: Codeless Tech Debate

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert (robert@amanda.jpunix.com) wrote:

: perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) writes:

: > How about an equivalent three-level operator's test in some other modes
: > like packet, AMTOR, RTTY, etc?

: How about just completing the current examination requirements?
: Contrary to popular opinion, it's NOT a big deal. It just requires
: effort.

: Unfortunately, the current "welfare mentality" doesn't reward effort.

: --Robert

And while we are at it, let's talk about setting requirements for using your computer. To use your computer, consider requiring 1.) you demonstrate the ability to type at 20 words per minute (of course, using all ten fingers), and 2.) you demonstrate the ability to write a device driver in your computer's native machine language (not assembly... you have to show you can calculate branch targets in hex...).

Mitch, WA4OSR

--

fmitch@netcom.com

Felton Mitchell, WA4OSR in Mobile, Alabama USA

co-sysop for W4IAX bbs running fbb ... sysop for WA4OSR DXCluster in Mobile..

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 1993 17:28:16 GMT

From: brunix!pstc3!md@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2334@arrl.org>, ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:

|> 7. How to "cheat" on the CW test. Purists will hate me, but I will
|> point out that with most VEs you don't need solid copy to be
|> able to pass the CW test.

Actually, Ed, from what I hear you can't "cheat" anymore.

If you remember our supper with NN1U, he indicated that according to W5YI, you now have to have enough code copy on your copy sheet to justify the answers that you put down on your multiple-choice answer sheet.

According to other VE sources in this area, there have actually been cases where an individual "guessed" correctly on 7 out of the 10 questions, but the VE team was not going to award him credit and a CSCE because he did not have the necessary copy on his code sheet. Apparently, only after a very loud disagreement on the part of several of the testing VEs did they "agree" to give him the credit.

Personally, I think it is a very dangerous precedent. Do we next allow VEs to decide whether or not the person who took the theory exam "really knew" the theory, or did the testee

just "guess" - thus allowing the VEs to throw the testee's answer sheet out the door? As it is now, VEs are allowed to put their own "comments" on a person's CW disability waiver - hmmm, I guess VEs will have to be accredited in all fields of the medical profession soon too, huh?

What legal recourse does a testee have if a VE "decides" that s/he didn't pass the exam? Can "comments" put on a testee's disability waiver be considered "libel"? If so, will the ARRL VEC pay appropriate legal expenses associated with any court cases that arise from their VEs actions?

Perhaps Bart Jahnke can even respond to this message and give us a little insight into the ARRL's "policies" in these matters.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Population Studies & Training Center
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912
-- (401) 863-2668

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Population Studies & Training Center
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912
-- (401) 863-2668

Date: 29 Sep 93 11:53:17 CDT
From: timbuk.cray.com!walter.cray.com!renaissance!www@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2307@arrl.org>, <DRT.93Sep27215041@cacciatore.mit.edu>,
<1993Sep28.235129.16589@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: Internet on the air

In article <1993Sep28.235129.16589@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

|> In article <DRT.93Sep27215041@cacciatore.mit.edu> drt@athena.mit.edu (David R Tucker) writes:

|> >packet's far less

|> >interesting than either cw or the internet. If you want to sit at a

|> >terminal and type stuff in, why wait days for a message you can send

|> >in seconds, right here?

|> We can experiment with topologies, protocols, and

|> encoding schemes to our heart's content on our own networks. People

|> who merely sit and type things in serve a useful purpose as test data
|> generators.

There is an old joke among us systems programmer types that application
programmers and end-users are nothing but a 'test load'. :-)

Walt

Walt Spector
(www@renaissance.cray.com)
Sunnyvale, California

..- ..- -..... -' ..-

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 1993 10:13:02 -0700
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node_142cf.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep28.151710.23737@cs.brown.edu>,
<1993Sep29.004421.16932@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <CE3p6w.JJC@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: Codeless Tech Debate

In article <CE3p6w.JJC@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu
(Jeff Herman) wrote:

> Your ignorance of radio history is showing here, Gary. In the early '20s
> hams had everything below 200 meters (i.e., everything above 1500 kHz).

You too have a problem. Hams did not have an exclusive assignment to 200
meters and down, they were the *onlu* service _restricted_ to that area.
When the "short waves" were discovered it took no time at all for the
commercial operators to move in!

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #355
